

Straight Talk

The raid of County Attorney I. E. Willey and some deputy sheriffs on the Casa Contentia and the Fish club on Tuesday evening, while considerably delayed, was a move in the right direction and it is to be hoped that such places on the outskirts of town will be permanently closed. There have been numerous raids on the Casa in the past, but after a little stimulant was confiscated and some people arrested and the second day story was published, the place has been allowed to continue as before.

Is that to follow the latest raid, or are the houses to be closed or made respectable?

The story goes that there has been no lack of evidence at any time against these places. Hundreds of citizens and among them, many ladies and gentlemen of prominence could easily testify regarding the character of the dives, but the officers have not seen fit to do anything until this week when the spectacular stuff was pulled, followed by the remark appearing in the Herald-Republican of Wednesday which read: "Assertions that the place has been allowed to operate with immunity are entirely untrue." If it has not been allowed to operate with immunity, then what? There has certainly been something very peculiar in the operation of these dives. There has never been anything mysterious about them. Anybody could go at any time and nearly everybody did go. The resorts should be cleaned or closed without any further parley on the subject.

* * *

We have heard nothing further regarding the rumor that the Utah Power & Light Company is negotiating for the purchase of Saltair and the funny railroad connecting the city with the resort. When the news was first sprung, it was music to the ears of Salt Lakers who are still hopeful that it is true that the big progressive corporation will relieve Joseph Nelson of the management of the resort before another season opens.

So the people may know something of the methods of Mr. Nelson, in his attempt to stifle publicity regarding the filthy place of which he is the head, we will cite something which occurred immediately following the Weekly's exposure of conditions at the resort.

Mr. Nelson immediately took his telephone in hand and called those advertising patrons of the paper with whom he was dealing and told them that unless they withdrew their patronage from the Weekly, he would be obliged to discontinue the purchase of anything from them, and all the while he was rushing into print with statements that everything possible was being done to purify his resort.

For some reason advertisements were not withdrawn, but it wasn't the fault of Mr. Nelson whose management of Saltair has made that resort a stench in the nostrils of the community instead of the pride that it should be.

* * *

We note that the Democrats and Progressives have numerous attorneys working on new legislation to be brought up at the session of the legislature, among other contemplated measures, being one for prohibition and one creating a public utilities commission. Then there are others of less importance but which go to show that unless a stop is put to it, we are to again suffer from an inundation of freak legislation. Why isn't it possible to have just one legislative session in which the senators and representatives would work for the best good of all concerned without putting the brakes on big and little business alike to the utter disgust of citizens who feel that there are already too many useless laws, and who believe that the province of the legislator is not to stir up useless trouble?

The issue of the Tribune on Friday the 13th, was apparently a Commissioner Park edition of that paper, which explained under large heads on its leading local page, that Mayor Park had obtained valuable concessions from the Utan Light and Traction Company, and that after a three years' struggle he had effected a remarkable reduction in insurance rates. From the tenor of the articles it was easy to see that the police commissioner was entirely responsible for the lowering of fire premiums and also the concessions granted by the power company by which we are to save from twelve to twenty-seven per cent in our light and power bills. Karl Scheid must have read with considerable amusement the account of how the mayor single-handed and alone had brought the insurance people to time. Commissioners Morris, Sherman, Wells and Lawrence were probably also greatly pleased to learn that they have done nothing in the matter of extending the water system and making other improvements and that they are really of little consequence in comparison to the works wrought by Sam and God.

We haven't any objection to giving credit where credit is due, but the way the police commissioner rushes into print every few days with the assistance of his favorite author, is one of the funniest performances in the political arena. Sam has always been a great jokesmith, however, even in the days of his ventriloquism, and it is just possible that he is again practicing the art in front of his favorite author, explaining that his associates are merely dummies and that he is the main gazeek. It's a bully good system apparently and it works fine. Hooray for you, Sam!

THE CAUSE

Editor Goodwin's Weekly.

Will you please say through Goodwin's Weekly what was the underlying cause, and the direct cause, of the demonetization of silver?

I have generally understood that the direct cause was legislative trickery, and if that is true, it would be interesting to know what were the "underlying" causes.

Yours very truly,

H. Pembroke.

The direct cause was a bill prepared by J. J. Knox, the then comptroller of the currency, entitled: "For the better regulation of the currency."

In the bill, among a mass of verbiage, a sneak clause was included the effect of which would demonetize silver if the bill passed. In committee it was in charge of a trusted agent of the thieves who assured the committee that the bill was merely what it purported to be and was intended merely to expedite and simplify the clerical work in the comptroller's office. The same representations were made to congress and the bill was passed and signed by President Grant. Neither Grant nor four-fifths of congress knew what was intended until the crime was actually committed.

The far-back cause was a conspiracy among the interest gatherers of London and our eastern cities to make the interest-bearing debts of the United States and railroad corporations—then amounting to a sum greater than all the money in the world amounted to, perpetual.

So great was the depression that followed that in 1878 the Sherman law, providing for the purchase and coinage of 4,000,000 ounces monthly of silver, was passed.

The final quietus came when the interest gatherers elected Mr. Cleveland, then made the panic of 1893, which supplied him with an excuse to call congress in extraordinary session and to demand the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law, which he bulldozed through congress.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROHIBITION

Who will indemnify the brewers of Washington and Oregon who, as a result of the Prohibitionists' success in those two states and their failure in California, are pulling stakes and said to be preparing to transfer their plants to San Francisco?

The brewers cannot remove their buildings, and their machinery and other portable property must suffer some damage through handling and jarring in transit. New sites must be purchased and new buildings erected in the new location, and the cost of transportation of such parts of the plants as can be removed is in itself a heavy expense. Some considerable loss of time must also be added to the account.

Who will reimburse the brewers, the Prohibitionists or the respective state governments?

Surely, a portion of the people, even if it be the majority, cannot drive a person or corporation out of business without making good the attendant financial loss to the injured party. And it is questionable if they have the right to interfere with legitimate business at all.

If there is any one thing the people of the United States take pride in above all others, it is a generous measure of liberty.

It was John Stuart Mill who held that an individual's liberty should be limited only by the same measure of liberty of his fellow men.

In other words, that he should have the right to do as he pleases as long as he does not offend or injure others.

Mill did not specify any particular actions, or to what extent they might reasonably be carried; but we are pretty sure that if any one had asked him if he considered it within the scope of personal privileges to indulge in a glass of beer or a Scotch highball, he would have replied in the affirmative.

Mill did not believe that a minority should be compelled to sacrifice their personal privileges on the altar of oppression erected by a majority led astray by a small body of molly-coddlers.

And this is precisely the sentiment of most Americans. Our personal privileges are sacred and should be immune from any encroachment.

We delight in speaking of our "constitutional rights."

Prohibition is an infringement upon our constitutional rights.

Amendment XIV, Section 1 of the Constitution of the United States provides that, "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges of immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law...."

If the decree of one portion of the people that another portion shall be constrained from taking a glass of beer or a highball is not an abridgement of the privileges of the second group, we should like to know what does constitute such an abridgement.

Also, we should like to have explained to us by what "process of law" the brewers of Washington and Oregon are being deprived of the use of their property.

Any man has a perfect right to walk up Market street. That is one of his personal privileges.

But if he should undertake to break another man's store window on the way because he didn't like the articles displayed in it, he would be arrested and compelled to reimburse the owner of the window.

For to smash a window would be overstepping his personal privileges and inflicting injury upon others.

On the same principle, by inflicting injury upon the brewers, the Prohibitionists of Washing-